

Please provide the following information, and submit to the NOAA DM Plan Repository.

Reference to Master DM Plan (if applicable)

As stated in Section IV, Requirement 1.3, DM Plans may be hierarchical. If this DM Plan inherits provisions from a higher-level DM Plan already submitted to the Repository, then this more-specific Plan only needs to provide information that differs from what was provided in the Master DM Plan.

URL of higher-level DM Plan (if any) as submitted to DM Plan Repository:

1. General Description of Data to be Managed**1.1. Name of the Data, data collection Project, or data-producing Program:**

2019 FEMA Lidar: 19 County MI

1.2. Summary description of the data:

This metadata record describes the Classified Point Cloud for the 2019 19 County FEMA Michigan LiDAR project. The data collection was funded by NRCS and USGS and the State of Michigan was in charge of collection. Nineteen counties (some with only partial coverage) were collected in total, though not all are available yet. This record will be updated as more counties are added.

Product: These lidar data are processed Classified LAS 1.4 files, formatted to individual 2500 ft x 2500 ft tiles; used to create intensity images, 3D breaklines and hydro-flattened DEMs as necessary.

Dataset Description: The FEMA 19 County, Michigan 2019 Lidar project called for the Planning, Acquisition, processing and derivative products of lidar data to be collected at a nominal pulse spacing (NPS) of 0.7 meter. Project specifications are based on the U.S. Geological Survey National Geospatial Program Base Lidar Specification, Version 1.3. The data was developed based on a horizontal projection/datum of NAD83 (2011), State Plane Coordinate System, international feet and vertical datum of NAVD88 (GEOID12B), international feet. Lidar data was delivered as processed Classified LAS 1.4 files, formatted to individual 2500 ft x 2500 ft tiles, as tiled Intensity Imagery, and as tiled bare earth DEMs; all tiled to the same 2500 ft x 2500 ft schema.

Ground Conditions: Lidar was collected in spring 2019, while no snow was on the ground and rivers were at or below normal levels. In order to post process the lidar data to meet task order specifications and meet ASPRS vertical accuracy guidelines, Sanborn Map Company, Inc. established ground control points that were used to calibrate the lidar to known ground locations established throughout the project area. Additional independent accuracy check points in Open Terrain/Bare-Earth and Urban landcovers, in Grass, Brush and Trees categories were used to assess the vertical accuracy of the data. These check points were not used to calibrate or post process the data.

The NOAA Office for Coastal Management (OCM) downloaded laz files from this USGS

site and processed the data to the Data Access Viewer (DAV) and to https:

ftp://rockyftp.cr.usgs.gov/vdelivery/Datasets/Staged/Elevation/LPC/Projects/MI_FEMA_2019_C19/

Counties included: Alcona, Oscoda, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Crawford, Kalkaska & Gogebic.

1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?

One-time data collection

1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:

2019-05-17 to 2019-10-23

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -90.42707, E: -83.26, N: 46.6294, S: 44.498939

1.6. Type(s) of data:

(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)

Model (digital)

1.7. Data collection method(s):

(e.g., satellite, airplane, unmanned aerial system, radar, weather station, moored buoy, research vessel, autonomous underwater vehicle, animal tagging, manual surveys, enforcement activities, numerical model, etc.)

1.8. If data are from a NOAA Observing System of Record, indicate name of system:

1.8.1. If data are from another observing system, please specify:

2. Point of Contact for this Data Management Plan (author or maintainer)

2.1. Name:

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

2.2. Title:

Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

2.4. E-mail address:

coastal.info@noaa.gov

2.5. Phone number:

(843) 740-1202

3. Responsible Party for Data Management

Program Managers, or their designee, shall be responsible for assuring the proper management of the data produced by their Program. Please indicate the responsible party below.

3.1. Name:

3.2. Title:

Data Steward

4. Resources

Programs must identify resources within their own budget for managing the data they produce.

4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?

Yes

4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management (specify percentage or "unknown"):

Unknown

5. Data Lineage and Quality

NOAA has issued Information Quality Guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information which it disseminates.

5.1. Processing workflow of the data from collection or acquisition to making it publicly accessible

(describe or provide URL of description):

Process Steps:

- 2019-01-01 00:00:00 - The following steps describe the Raw Data Processing and Calibration process: 1) Technicians processed the raw data to LAS format flight lines using the ABGNSS/IMU solution. 2) Technicians use TerraSolid TerraMatch to calculate initial calibration adjustment angles by mission and/or block. This is accomplished by identifying ground and above ground feature observations between flight-lines and calculating the offsets. The technician then analyzed the results and made any necessary additional adjustment until it is acceptable. 3) Once the angle calculation was completed the adjusted settings were applied to all of the flight-lines of the mission and/or block and checked for consistency. The technicians utilized commercial and proprietary software packages to analyze how well flight-line overlaps match and adjusted as necessary until the results met the project specifications. 4) The technicians checked and corrected the vertical misalignment of all flight-lines and also the matching between data and ground truth. The relative accuracy was less than or equal to 6 cm RMSEz within individual swaths and less than or equal to 8 cm RMSDz or within swath overlap (between adjacent swaths). 5) The technicians ran a final vertical accuracy check of the calibrated point cloud against the surveyed check points after the z correction to ensure the requirement of NVA = 19.6 cm 95% Confidence Level (Required Accuracy) was met. Point classification was performed according to USGS Lidar Base Specification 1.3, and breaklines were collected for water features. Bare earth DEMs were exported from

the classified point cloud using collected breaklines for hydroflattening. (Citation: 8235_Survey_Lower_Peninsula)

- 2019-06-29 00:00:00 - LAS Point Classification: The point classification is performed as described below. The bare-earth surface is manually reviewed to ensure correct classification on the Class 2 (Ground) points. After the bare-earth surface is edited and QC'd, it is then used to generate all hydro-breaklines through heads-up digitization. All ground (ASPRS Class 2) lidar data inside of the Lake Pond and River Pond hydro flattening breaklines were then classified to water (ASPRS Class 9) using LP360 functionality. A buffer of 2 feet was also used around each hydro-flattened feature to classify these ground (ASPRS Class 2) points to Ignored ground (ASPRS Class 20). All Lake Pond Island and River Stream Island features were checked to ensure that the ground (ASPRS Class 2) points were reclassified to the correct classification after the automated classification was completed. All overlap data was processed through automated functionality provided by TerraScan to classify the overlapping flight-line data to approved classes by USGS. The overlap data was classified using standard LAS overlap bit. These classes were created through automated processes only and were not verified for classification accuracy. All data was manually reviewed and any remaining artifacts removed using functionality provided by TerraScan and TerraModeler. Global Mapper is used as a final check of the bare-earth dataset. GeoCue was then used to create the deliverable industry-standard LAS files for the Classified Point Cloud Data. LAStools, LP360 and TerraScan software was used to perform statistical analysis of the classes in the LAS files, on a per tile level to verify classification metrics and full LAS header information.

- Data for Alcona, Oscoda, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Gogebic, Crawford & Kalkaska counties was downloaded from the USGS Rocky ftp site in NAD83(2011) Michigan North & Central State Plane (Int ft) coordinates with vertical feet NAVD88 (Geoid12b) elevations. Data were converted to geographic coordinates, from vertical feet to meters, and to ellipsoid heights (using Geoid 12b) for ingest in the NOAA Digital Coast Data Access Viewer. The observed classes process to the Data Access Viewer are: 1 = unclassified, 2 = ground, 7 = low noise, 9 = water, 17 = bridge deck, 18 = high noise, 20 = ignored ground near breakline

5.1.1. If data at different stages of the workflow, or products derived from these data, are subject to a separate data management plan, provide reference to other plan:

5.2. Quality control procedures employed (describe or provide URL of description):

6. Data Documentation

The EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive requires that NOAA data be well documented, specifies the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for documentation of new data, and provides links to resources and tools for metadata creation and validation.

6.1. Does metadata comply with EDMC Data Documentation directive?

No

6.1.1. If metadata are non-existent or non-compliant, please explain:

Missing/invalid information:

- 1.7. Data collection method(s)
- 3.1. Responsible Party for Data Management
- 5.2. Quality control procedures employed
- 7.1.1. If data are not available or has limitations, has a Waiver been filed?
- 7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination
- 8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility

6.2. Name of organization or facility providing metadata hosting:

NMFS Office of Science and Technology

6.2.1. If service is needed for metadata hosting, please indicate:**6.3. URL of metadata folder or data catalog, if known:**

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/63421>

6.4. Process for producing and maintaining metadata

(describe or provide URL of description):

Metadata produced and maintained in accordance with the NOAA Data Documentation Procedural Directive: https://nosc.noaa.gov/EDMC/DAARWG/docs/EDMC_PD-Data_Documentation_v1.pdf

7. Data Access

NAO 212-15 states that access to environmental data may only be restricted when distribution is explicitly limited by law, regulation, policy (such as those applicable to personally identifiable information or protected critical infrastructure information or proprietary trade information) or by security requirements. The EDMC Data Access Procedural Directive contains specific guidance, recommends the use of open-standard, interoperable, non-proprietary web services, provides information about resources and tools to enable data access, and includes a Waiver to be submitted to justify any approach other than full, unrestricted public access.

7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?

Yes

7.1.1. If the data are not to be made available to the public at all, or with limitations, has a Waiver (Appendix A of Data Access directive) been filed?**7.1.2. If there are limitations to public data access, describe how data are protected from unauthorized access or disclosure:**

7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:

NOAA Office for Coastal Management (NOAA/OCM)

7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:**7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:**

<https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/lidar/search/where:ID=9231/details/9231>

https://coast.noaa.gov/htdata/lidar1_z/geoid18/data/9231/

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:

Data is available online for bulk or custom downloads

7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:

7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:

8. Data Preservation and Protection

The NOAA Procedure for Scientific Records Appraisal and Archive Approval describes how to identify, appraise and decide what scientific records are to be preserved in a NOAA archive.

8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location:

(Specify NCEI-MD, NCEI-CO, NCEI-NC, NCEI-MS, World Data Center (WDC) facility, Other, To Be Determined, Unable to Archive, or No Archiving Intended)

NCEI_CO

8.1.1. If World Data Center or Other, specify:**8.1.2. If To Be Determined, Unable to Archive or No Archiving Intended, explain:****8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility (if any):**

Office for Coastal Management - Charleston, SC

8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility:**8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?**

Discuss data back-up, disaster recovery/contingency planning, and off-site data storage relevant to the data collection

Data is backed up to tape and to cloud storage.

9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions

Line and Staff Offices may extend this template by inserting additional questions in this section.